

**Jane Rose**

**MA TEFL**

**Module 4 Spoken Discourse**

**Record one of your (or a colleague's) English classes and transcribe part of your data.**

**Make an analysis of the transcribed data using Sinclair and Coulthard's model, at the level of exchange, move and act (Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. 1975 'Towards an analysis of discourse: the English used by teachers and pupils'. Oxford: OUP)**

**Comment on how easy/difficult it was to fit your data to the categories and the usefulness of this kind of analysis for understanding classroom communication**

### **1. Introduction**

The teacher in the language classroom is not really able to look objectively at both her own language output and those of her students and effectively evaluate this aspect of a lesson in situ. Moreover, a teacher's impression of the language produced by the students in any one lesson can be very different from the reality. If one of our aims as teachers is to equip our students for communicating in the 'real' world, it behoves us to develop awareness of the kind of language they are actually producing inside the classroom and the way we as teachers can facilitate or restrict learner communication. An objective analysis of teacher and student language may help in this process. This essay seeks to look at to what extent the Sinclair-Coulthard model for discourse analysis is a useful one for analysing and understanding language produced in the classroom by attempting to apply the model to a piece of recorded classroom discourse.

The first part of the essay will review the literature on the Sinclair-Coulthard model in order to give an overview of the original model together with some of the later developments. This section will be followed by a description of the process and procedure of gathering, analysing and presenting the recorded data which will lead in to a discussion of the problems encountered while trying to fit the data into the Sinclair-Coulthard model. In the next section some applications for teachers and teaching will be considered and finally I will offer my conclusions on the overall usefulness of this kind of analysis for understanding classroom communication. My analysis and transcription are included as appendices.

## **2. Literature Review**

The Sinclair-Coulthard model of discourse analysis was developed in 1975 as part of a ‘continuing investigation of language function and the organisation of linguistic units above the rank of clause’ (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975: 1). The model provides a way of analysing spoken discourse produced in the structured and institutionalised environment of the classroom where the teacher could be expected to ‘be exerting the maximum amount of control over the structure of the discourse’ (ibid: 6). It has also proved useful for analysing discourse produced in other relatively tightly structured situations, such as between doctors and patients, which may come under the general heading of ‘institutional dialogue’ (Drew and Sorjonen 1997: 92).

The Sinclair-Coulthard model is organised on the basis of rank scale which parallels Halliday’s 1961 ‘rank scale description of grammar’ (Willis 1992: 112). In the

original model there are five proposed ranks: *lesson*, *transaction*, *exchange*, *move* and *act* which relate hierarchically.

Lesson  
Transaction  
Exchange  
Move  
Act

A *lesson* consists of *transactions* which are composed of a number of *exchanges*. An *exchange* in turn comprises a number of *moves* which can be divided into *acts*; the *act* being the smallest analysable functional unit in a discourse. However, Sinclair and Coulthard were unable to conclusively define a lesson in terms of the number or type of transactions, so the category was subsequently regarded as a 'stylistic type' (Sinclair and Coulthard 1992: 34).

The exchange has been defined as 'the basic unit of interaction' (Sinclair and Coulthard 1992: 64), and as a 'significant unit of discourse' (McCarthy 1991: 122), and much of the interest in spoken discourse has been at this level. Exchanges are divided into *teaching* and *boundary exchanges*: *boundary exchanges* signalling stages in the lesson by the teacher, and *teaching exchanges* showing the way any particular lesson is progressing. Five moves make up the exchanges: *framing and focusing moves* realise the boundary exchanges and *initiate, respond and follow-up moves* (I, R, F) realise the teaching exchanges. The 22 acts identified by Sinclair and Coulthard combine to make up the moves.

The original DA model has been criticised mainly because of the difficulty of using it to analyse talk in more spontaneous and informal situations, particularly if there are more than two interlocutors. This has led to modifications by a number of

researchers, among them Coulthard and Brazil (1992: 50-78), Francis and Hunston (1992: 123-161), Willis (1992:111-122) and Tsui (1992: 89-110). The modifications are concerned with enlarging the exchange structure, highlighting the significance of intonation in discourse and introducing greater flexibility to the model, especially at act level.

The next section will go on to look at the process of carrying out an analysis on a piece of recorded classroom discourse as preparation for discussion on how well the discourse was able to be analysed using the original Sinclair-Coulthard model.

### **3. The Analysis in Context**

#### **3.1 The lesson**

The data used in the analysis was recorded at the vocational training centre in Finland where I work. The six students in the class are male, aged between 16 and 22 and are nearing the end of their first year in a three year course for Electronics and Computing. They attend a compulsory double lesson of English per week as part of their general studies program.

The recorded lesson was part of a linked series of lessons concerned with enabling the students to present their course and their department to potential foreign visitors. The previous week the whole group had visited their department where two students showed them around, talked about what goes on in the department, and responded to questions. In this lesson the students were given a worksheet with starter sentences

relating to various aspects of their course which they were required to complete individually. Following this the teacher facilitated a feedback session where the group responses were conflated on the board. The students were then given time to add anything they felt necessary before reading out their own individual presentation to the class.

### **3.2 The analysed material**

Two extracts from the double lesson were chosen for analysis. The first extract comprises approximately eight minutes taken from the last 15 minutes of the first lesson where the teacher was obtaining feedback from the worksheets. This extract is characterised by a question and answer format, with the teacher having to work quite hard to get the students to answer. Although the worksheet questions are known to all and the teacher has an idea of the subject area the answers will be concerned with, she is mostly asking referential rather than display questions.

The second extract lasts a little over one and a half minutes, and is taken from the middle of the second lesson where the teacher is participating in a student initiated discussion on the forthcoming school magazine. This section is characterised by its features of everyday conversation.

### **3.3 Presentation of the analysis**

The recorded data was transcribed and then analysed using the Sinclair-Coulthard DA model as described by Sinclair and Coulthard (1992: 5-34). Bearing in mind Coulthard's caveat that '[i]t is always difficult to represent structural analyses in two dimensions'(Coulthard 1985: 127), the format chosen to present the analysis is similar

to that illustrated in Coulthard (ibid: 128) with the horizontal lines denoting an exchange boundary, and three vertical columns showing the moves within the exchange, (IRF). These are read from left to right across the page. It was felt useful to include the exchange types so that the kinds of exchange taking place within the transactions could be seen. The final column shows the number of the exchange for easy reference and in the absence of any more obvious satisfactory way of showing the difference between bound and free exchanges, the convention of underlining the bound exchange ‘classes’ was adopted. It was also considered important to indicate who was doing the talking at each move as there were several student initiated exchanges. Other conventions used in the presentation of the analysis can be seen in the notes preceding the analysis itself in appendix 1.

The following section will go on to comment on the analysis in more detail, prior to highlighting the problems which became apparent when trying to analyse the data according to the Sinclair-Coulthard model.

#### **4. Problems of alignment: fitting the data to the Sinclair-Coulthard model**

The DA model was developed using recorded classroom data. Inevitably classroom teachers have an individual style and ‘some types of teaching will be more easily described than others in this model, particularly...where the teacher takes a controlling role and conducts fairly ritual conversation with the pupils’ (Sinclair and Brazil 1982:3). The two extracts of data which comprise my analysis contrast markedly in style. For example, extract one is teacher directed, and is fairly tightly controlled despite some examples of student initiated exchanges, and on these grounds it might be expected that the data could be described reasonably well using

the DA model. Extract two shows by contrast the teacher responding to a student initiated question which leads into discussion around the topic raised. Although I have attempted to analyse this extract according to the Sinclair-Coulthard model, given the features of everyday conversation to be observed, not least the fact that this section of discourse could be equally appropriate outside the classroom, it would probably be more satisfactorily analysed using the later Francis and Hunsten model (Francis and Hunsten 1992: 123-161), and this is discussed more fully in section 4.2 below.

#### 4.1 Extract 1: problems and possible solutions

While much of the discourse in extract one could be analysed within the IRF format, certain exchanges posed problems which were difficult to resolve within the DA model. They will be considered below.

##### 4.1.1 Exchange 2

The original S-C model allowed for one person talking at once. In this exchange there is an occurrence of two utterances overlapping.

<p>S1: (<i>reading</i>) We have a small computer room where we do works with autocad and <i>neljatoistas</i> and pads. (<i>rep</i>)   There's are different   kinds of computer programs. (<i>com</i>)</p>	<p>T:   Do works (<i>z</i>) <i>while writing on the board</i> (<i>acc</i>) OK. (<i>acc</i>)</p>	<p>2</p>
--	---	----------

The teacher is commenting to herself as she writes on the board, which I take as a form of non-verbal feedback, while the student offers an explanation of what he has

just read out before receiving verbal teacher follow-up. I have indicated the overlapping and put both verbal and non-verbal responses from the teacher in the follow-up slot.

#### 4.1.2 Exchanges 3, 4, 23, 26, 38 and 40

These exchanges all show instances of a teacher requesting clarification/confirmation of her understanding of a student response, which I found difficult to classify at act level under the DA model. The three possible alternatives initially seemed to be those shown below. They are followed by the relevant parts of exchanges 3 and 23 which show examples of the two act categories referred to in the following discussion.

*Elicitation*: realised by a question. Its function is to request a linguistic response.

*Check*: ...real questions...The function... is to enable the teacher to ascertain whether there are any problems preventing the successful progress of the lesson.

*Loop*: ...rising intonation and a few questions like ‘did you say’, do you mean’. Its function is to return the discourse to the stage it was at before the pupil spoke, from where it can proceed normally.

From Sinclair and Coulthard’s ‘classes of acts’ (1992: 19-21).

Elicit*	T: So ( <i>reading</i> ) ‘welcome to the department. My name is’ and everybody’s got their own name that’s fine, there’s no problem with that. But number two ( <i>reading</i> ) ‘we have a small computer room where we..’ so let’s put ideas for that together. (s) Henkka, could you start. (n) What do you do in the small computer room? (el)	S1: ( <i>reading</i> ) We have a small computer room where we do works with autocad and <i>neljatoistas</i> and pads.(rep)   There’s are different kinds of computer programs. (com)	T:   Do works (z) <i>while writing on board</i> (acc) OK (acc)	2
Elicit *	T: So we do work with autocad?	S1: Autocad (acc)	T: <i>writes on board</i>	3

	(el)		(ack)	
--	------	--	-------	--

Elicit*	T: Marko (n) Could you start (n) Number 3. What did you have for number 3? That big room where we were listening to Sami and Markus last week. (s) What did you have?	S6: (reading) We repair computers, TV's ja teokkeet (and amplifiers) (rep)	T: Writing on board (ack)	22
Repeat*	T: Did you say amplifiers? (l)	S6: Yes (rep)	T: Yes (acc)	23

Although checking does seem to be intuitively what the teacher is doing in these acts, Sinclair and Coulthard's category of checking seems too closely defined to be applicable. I therefore decided to use both *elicitation* (for exchanges 3 and 38) and *loop* (for exchanges 4, 23, 26 and 40) as can be seen in the analysis, but I am not totally satisfied that either category really captures what is going on functionally in these exchanges. I have used *elicitation* when there seems to be a definite indication that the utterance starts a new exchange as there has already been some form of follow-up after the student response (the intonation used would also confirm this), and I have used *loop* when it seems more as if the teacher is trying to make sense of the student response. However, Francis and Hunsten's category of *return* would seem to encapsulate these examples more succinctly.

*Return*: realised by a question, often ellipted...Its function is to seek clarification of a preceding utterance.

(Francis and Hunston 1992 : 130)

#### 4.1.3 Exchanges 6-10

Elicit	T: Janne (n) Did you have anything different from that? (el)	S2: (reading) The room where are, (rep)		6
Student	S2:	T:		7

Elicit	<i>Onko sita kolme?</i> (asking in Finnish if this is number 3) (el)	's two, number two (rep)		
Repeat	T: Have you got anything different from (p)			8
Elicit	S2: In Finnish questioning neighbouring student where he should be on the worksheet. (el)	S1: <i>Sano nyt ensin tuo kakkonen.</i> ( say number two first) (el)		9
student inform*	S2: Excell, Excell (i)		T: OK (writing) (acc)	10

I found the above section of discourse very difficult to analyse satisfactorily within the Sinclair-Coulthard system as there is no allowance made for an embedded utterance within this model. 'The Birmingham group has so far tried to see exchanges as not permitting embedding, arguing that once a new exchange has begun, even if a previous one was incomplete, it is impossible to return and complete it' (Coulthard 1985: 143), although Coulthard does concede that some particular examples provide strong evidence for embedding (ibid 144).

I finally marked the student utterance 'excell, excell' as initiating a student inform exchange, but it doesn't sit satisfactorily with the intuitive feeling that this utterance is really a reply to the question asked originally in exchange 6 and repeated in exchange 8, with exchange 9 being an aside between two students, clarifying at what point in the worksheet they were. Although the Sinclair and Coulthard model provides for a teacher aside, there is no provision for a student aside.

#### 4.1.4 Exchange 16

Elicit	T: Markus, did you have anything else to add to that? (n) Anything else that was different? (el)	S4: Er Words, Microsoft Words. (rep)	T: OK (acc) <i>Writing on board</i>	15
Student	S4:		T:	16

inform*	Words (i)		Mm (ack)	
---------	-----------	--	----------	--

In this exchange S4 repeated what he had previously said after this had been written on the board. It is difficult to determine from the recording whether he is repeating his answer as feedback to the teacher, or is reading aloud from the board. I have tentatively classified his utterance as a *student inform* followed by teacher *acknowledgement*. Coulthard states reassuringly that ‘...inferencing is an integral part of interpreting utterances’ (Coulthard 1985: 155).

#### 4.1.5 Exchange 30

Elicit*	T: Henkka did you have anything to add there? (n)	S1: <i>Onko video?</i> (is there video?) (rep) T: i)No there isn't (rep)	T: ii)Writes on board (ack)	30
---------	--	---	--------------------------------	----

This exchange is a problem to analyse under the original model where ‘*all* eliciting exchanges have the potential of a three-part structure’ (Coulthard and Brazil 1992: 66). However, when considering the exchange structure as re-stated in the updated model, I (R/I) R (F) (ibid: 72), the exchange can now be analysed satisfactorily as:  
I R/I R F.

#### 4.1.6 Exchanges 33/34

Inform*	T: If we think of them all as electronic equipment. (i) Do you know the word equipment? (s) Or electronic equipment, electronic machines? (el) So we can be general or we can be specific, and, and maybe it's more interesting to say what they actually are and it's simpler. (com)			33
Student inform*	S4: Tools, electronic tools. (i)		T: OK tools as well I'm sure (acc) Anything anybody wants you to repair I'm sure they send over. (com)	34

These series of moves pose difficulties as to whether they should be analysed as one or two exchanges. This is because the teacher asks a series of questions and doesn't really give the students time to answer before offering a comment on the *inform* she has originally given at the start of the initiation. I have therefore analysed them as two separate exchanges and classified S4's utterance as an *inform* as it is unclear even from the recording whether he is commenting on the teacher's *inform* and offering his alternative term for 'equipment' or whether he is in fact referring back to an earlier exchange and offering another item for the list. In context the teacher seems to concur with this interpretation. A clearer example of this kind of interaction can be seen at exchange 43/44 where student S2 interrupts the teacher's focusing move to refer back to a previous question.

<b>Boundary</b> Frame Focus	T: Right^ (m) ( <i>reading</i> ) 'Our course is 3 years long' (ms)			43
Student inform	S2: Hei teacher! (b)		T: Right, OK. Theory	44

	Theory lessons (rep)		lessons (acc)	
--	----------------------	--	---------------	--

## 4.2 Extract II: problems and difficulties

This whole extract fits rather ‘hesitantly’ into the IRF framework, as can be seen from my attempted analysis using this model. This is partly because the original model only allows for IRF structure at exchange level as was mentioned in section 4.1.5 above, but also because this set of exchanges displays features of everyday conversation which are not accounted for in the Sinclair-Coulthard model. In this regard it is useful to compare the definitions of some of the acts in the Sinclair-Coulthard model with the definitions in the later Francis and Hunsten model (1992: 123ff), which while being rooted in the DA model was specifically developed for analysing everyday conversation.

For example, while both models have the act *informative*, there is a difference in emphasis regarding function, and what is ‘allowed’ as a response as can be seen below.

‘...its sole function is to provide is to provide information. The only response is an acknowledgement of attention or understanding.’  
(Sinclair and Coulthard 1992: 19)

‘Its function is to supply information or give a decision between “yes” or “no”.’  
(Francis and Hunsten 1992: 131)

This can be seen as providing an anomalous situation (regarding analysis) in exchange 54 where the teacher does acknowledge the student inform but goes on to provide information of her own in response within the same tone unit.

Student inform*	S4: Yeah, (m) But I er er really that want because I write very more etcetera. Er (laughs)(i) That magazine I write a here. (com)	T: Yes you've written for the magazine (ack) But nobody knows yet what is in the magazine because if they got more articles than they have space then they have to choose. (i)		54
-----------------	--	--	--	----

Likewise, the acts *elicitation* and *inquire* can be understood to be roughly equivalent, but the stated difference in function shows clearly the difference in intended context.

*Elicitation*: 'Realised by a question. Its function is to elicit a linguistic response'

(Sinclair and Coulthard 1992: 19)

*Inquire*: 'Realised by questions which seek information...Its function is to elicit information'

(Francis and Hunston 1992: 130)

This latter act category would seem the more appropriate in the context of the 'elicit' in exchange 46 below where the student is clearly seeking for information rather than requiring a linguistic response. This would similarly hold true for exchange 50, a later student elicit.

Student elicit*	S4: When er when er that course magazine is ready? (el)	T: When is it ready? (l)	S4: Yes (acc)	46
-----------------	--	-----------------------------	------------------	----

In the context of everyday conversation it would seem unnecessary to classify an exchange type as ‘student (or pupil) elicit’, as opposed to simply ‘elicit’, but it is interesting in terms of being able to clearly document a student eliciting and ‘driving’ the conversation within the context of the classroom, which may be considered less than usual. This observation can be extended to the two instances of ‘student inform’ at exchanges 54 and 55 respectively.

Exchange 51 shows an instance of an incomplete student question where the question is taken over and completed by the teacher in the form of a statement. I have marked this tentatively as a *reply* in the response slot. This kind of interaction where one interlocutor anticipates and finishes the other interlocutor’s utterance would intuitively give credence to the informality of the discourse.

Student elicit*	S4: Can I (el)	T: Have your own copy (rep)		51
-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------	--	----

Exchange 53 causes difficulty because of the impossibility of allowing more than one follow-up move in the same exchange as mentioned in 4.1.5 above. In the Francis and Hunsten model, the various possibilities for exchange structure are given as:

I (R/I) R (F<sup>n</sup>) (Francis and Hunsten 1992: 124), and within this structure the initiating move in this exchange would be acceptable as a second follow-up move in the previous exchange, which itself is bound to exchange 51.

<u>repeat</u>	S4: What? (I)	T: You were asking if you can get your own copy	S4: Yeah (acc)	52
---------------	------------------	---	-------------------	----

		(rep)		
Inform*	T: I hope so yes(acc) There isn't enough for everybody, but not everybody wants. (com)		S4: Yeah (ack)	53

In summary, many of the difficulties described above would probably be obviated if this part of the classroom discourse were analysed under a system developed for everyday conversation. The next section will go on to discuss the usefulness of this kind of analysis for understanding classroom communication.

## 5. Applications for teachers and teaching

An analysis of this type yields much that is of interest and of use in understanding classroom communication, including ‘...evaluat[ing] our own output as teachers and that of our students’ (McCarthy 1991: 19). It could be said that it is particularly difficult for teachers to objectively evaluate their own output in the course of regular classroom teaching, and that this kind of model is one tool a teacher could use to better understand what is going on in the classroom. To illustrate this, a few examples from my data which could have general application will be commented on.

### 5.1 Amount and quality of teacher and student talk time

The high ratio of teacher to student talk time is a striking feature of extract one, and supports Coulthard’s observation that ‘the teacher almost always has the last word and two turns to speak for every pupil turn’ (Coulthard 1985: 124). As well as looking at the relative amount of student talk time, carrying out this kind of analysis means it is

also possible to look at the type and quality of *acts* and *moves* the students are producing, and in a small class information can be gathered as to who is saying what.

Willis comments that ‘...most of the opportunities for language use are taken by the teacher’ (Willis 1996: 18), and even being aware of this I was genuinely surprised by how little the students actually said in extract one, as I had come away from the lesson with the impression of a much greater level of interaction between the students and the teacher than actually seemed to be the case. It is noticeable, however, in extract two where student S4 is much closer to the role of ‘dominant-speaker’ (McCarthy 1991: 111) that the quality and type of interaction is very different, with examples of student *elicits* and *informs* as opposed to only *replies*. It is also of note that here the subject being discussed is student initiated rather than being imposed by the teacher and the student is confidently taking his share in the interaction. This is something which is not found in extract one, where the student initiations are of a different nature. The analysis gives the teacher the opportunity to see graphically the relative amounts of talk time for all participants and also to look in more depth at what could facilitate and support more communicative interaction.

## **5.2 Teacher controlled class**

A noticeable difference between extracts one and two is in the high level of teacher control in extract one (despite some examples of student initiated exchanges). One indication of this difference can be seen in the large number of *nominations* used by the teacher. In 11 out of 38 exchanges (discounting boundary exchanges) the act

category *nomination* is used, but in the second, (admittedly short), extract there is not a single example. Francis and Hunsten's revised version of the Sinclair-Coulthard DA model, omits the act category 'nomination' (along with 'bid' and 'cue') as not occurring in two-party everyday conversation (Francis and Hunsten 1992: 125). Although the teacher seems to be using *nominate* in this class to encourage responses rather than to facilitate turn-taking, it still is indicative of a degree of teacher control which the teacher herself may be unaware of.

### **5.3 Boundary exchange markers**

In the eight *boundary exchanges* in extract one, it is interesting to note that out of the six possible markers identified by Sinclair and Coulthard (Sinclair and Coulthard 1992: 19) only two are used here: 'OK' is used five times and 'right' twice. This could be useful information for the teacher to be aware of when considering her own teaching style, as it is easy to perpetuate these 'speech mannerisms' without being aware of them, and therefore 'devaluing' the actual function of the marker in the discourse.

In the short student initiated extract two, there are no boundary moves at all, which seems to reflect everyday conversation where topics discussed are rarely named in advance because 'conversationalists do not have this degree of control' (Coulthard 1985: 123). This has implications for the so-called 'communicative classroom' where the teacher may be trying to facilitate genuine communication, but without the imposition of any specific topic. Through such an analysis it would be possible to evaluate how a particular interaction in the classroom compares with conversation outside the classroom.

#### 5.4 The follow-up move

It is important to recognise the relevance of the *follow-up* move for both teachers and learners. Sinclair and Coulthard observed that teaching exchanges in the classroom consist of three moves: initiation, response and follow-up (Sinclair and Coulthard 1992: 22-25). Questions asked in the initiation slot were almost inevitably *teacher elicit* display questions and the follow-up move was almost always an *evaluation* of the pupil's response. '[I]n the classroom [the follow-up move]...fulfils the vital role of telling pupils whether they have done what the teacher wanted them to do' (McCarthy 1991: 16). Berry points out that the follow-up move is not just restricted to the classroom and is a regular feature of non-classroom discourse. It is the *evaluative* function that seems to be connected with the teacher's role in the classroom (Berry 1981: 123).

In extract one despite a large number of teacher elicit exchanges there are only three instances of *evaluate* realising the follow-up move at the level of act. This could be because the questions asked are not true display questions in which the teacher knows the answer she requires, as the teacher here is actually seeking a range of responses within the area of the question to put up on the board for all to see. Hence she is able to *acknowledge* or *accept* most of the answers as relevant to the process going on in the class.

It would seem, therefore, to be important for the teacher to be able to look at her follow-up moves and understand their role in the students' learning process. Equally, students may need to be helped to understand the role of the follow-up move in 'real'

conversation. 'The lack of follow-up moves...can make students' conversational attempts seem stilted and distant' (Burns 2001: 132). Interestingly, in extract two, four out of the five follow-up moves were made by the student S4, adding to the impression of genuine conversation.

A follow-up move may also be non-verbal. In extract one there are two instances of the teacher writing on the board which I have analysed as non-verbal follow-up to a student response, (*exchanges 3 and 30* respectively) and many instances where the act *accept* in the follow-up slot is accompanied by the non-verbal (non-spoken) response of writing on the board by the teacher.

## **6. Conclusion**

In view of the considerable amount of time needed to carry out an analysis of this kind it is unlikely that it will ever be a regular feature of 'reflective teaching', but the dividends are well worth all the effort expended. Analysis is detailed work and the importance of intonation and pause in dividing discourse into exchanges, moves and acts should also be recognised. The completed analysis can give the teacher an objective view of a particular lesson, which it would be hard to obtain in other ways, even with the use of video. Through such analyses teachers are able to evaluate their own output and teaching style in conjunction with those of the students, and pick up on particular features of the discourse which may otherwise go un-noticed.

Despite some of the difficulties experienced with using the Sinclair and Coulthard model I have found this a valuable exercise, and it has been interesting to 'become intimate' with a group of students and myself as a teacher through spending many

hours with one lesson. I now appreciate the process of developing a model from specific data, and then modifying and revising it over time, but still adhering to the basic premise 'of attempting to handle an infinite number of events by the simplest possible description' (Sinclair and Coulthard 1992: 57).

## References

- Berry, M. (1981) 'Systemic linguistics and discourse analysis: a multi-layered approach to exchange structure' in Coulthard, M. and Montgomery, M. (eds) *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Burns, A. (2001) 'Analysing Spoken Discourse: implications for TESOL' in Burns, A. and Coffin, C. *Analysing English in a Global Context*. London :Routledge.
- Coulthard, M. (1985) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Harlow: Longman.
- Coulthard, M. and Brazil, D. (1992) 'Exchange Structure' in Coulthard, M. (ed)

- Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Drew, P. and Sorjonen, M. (1997) 'Institutional Dialogue' in Van Dijk, T.A. (ed) *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Francis, G. and Hunsten, S. (1992) 'Analysing Everyday Conversation' in Coulthard, M. (ed) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- McCarthy, M. (1991) *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1975) *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. and Brazil, D. (1982) *Teacher Talk*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1992) 'Towards an Analysis of Discourse' in Coulthard, M. (ed) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Tsui, A. (1992) 'A Functional Description of Questions' in Coulthard, M. (ed) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Willis, D. (1992) 'Caught in the Act: using the rank scale to address the problems of delicacy' in Coulthard, M. (ed) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Willis, J. (1996) *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. Harlow: Longman.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Classroom Analysis**

#### **Notes:**

T denotes Teacher

S1-6 denote the individual student

*Italics* are used for any Finnish; indicating when someone is reading; or when the teacher is writing on the board.

| shows when two people are talking at the same time.

\* exchanges in which there is a problem at act, move or exchange level. These are discussed in the essay (sections 4.1-4.3)

Underlined exchange type indicates a bound teaching exchange.

The term ‘pupil’ in the exchange types ‘pupil elicit’ and ‘pupil inform’ as categorised by Sinclair and Coulthard (1992: 27-28) has been changed to ‘student’ as it seemed more appropriate to this particular class.

In ‘teacher elicit’, and ‘teacher inform’ exchanges (there were no examples of ‘teacher direct’) the word teacher has been omitted.

There are a few instances of *aside* (z) by the teacher. These were distinguished in the recording by level intonation, and a markedly low volume of delivery, indicating that the teacher was talking to herself.

Classroom Analysis Extract 1 (7' 55'')							
Ex. Type	Initiation (I)	Act	Response (R)	Act	Follow-up (F)	Act	Ex
Boundary Frame Focus	T: OK ^ (m) I'd like to look at what everybody's got and put them together and then I'd like everybody to read out their own, so I don't know if that takes longer than 15						1

	minutes, but we'll see. (ms)			
Elicit*	T: So ( <i>reading</i> ) 'welcome to the department. My name is' and everybody's got their own name that's fine, there's no problem with that. But number two ( <i>reading</i> ) 'we have a small computer room where we..' so let's put ideas for that together. (s) Henkka, could you start. (n) What do you do in the small computer room? (el)	S1: ( <i>reading</i> ) We have a small computer room where we do works with autocad and <i>neljatoistas</i> and pads.(rep) There's are different kinds of computer programs. (com)	T:   Do works (z) <i>while writing on board</i> (acc) OK (acc)	2
Elicit *	T: So we do work with autocad? (el)	S1: Autocad (acc)	T: <i>writes on board</i> (ack)	3
<u>Repeat</u> *	T: And? ( <i>while writing</i> ) (el)	S1: Pads. (rep) P A D S ( <i>spelling</i> ) (i)	T: Fine (ack)	4
<b>Boundary Frame</b>	T: OK^ (m)			5
Elicit	T: Janne (n) Did you have anything different from that? (el)	S2: ( <i>reading</i> ) The room where are, (rep)		6
Student Elicit	S2: <i>Onko sita kolme?</i> (asking in Finnish if this is number 3) (el)	T: 's two, number two (rep)		7
<u>Repeat</u>	T: Have you got anything different from (p)			8
Elicit*	S2: In Finnish questioning neighbouring student where he should be on the worksheet. (el)	S1: <i>Sano nyt ensin tuo kakkonen.</i> ( say number two first) (el)		9
student inform*	S2: Excell, Excell (i)		T: OK(acc) <i>writing</i>	10
<u>Re-initiate</u>	T: Anything else?	S2: No (rep)	T: No (acc)	11
Elicit	T: OK Sami, did you have anything to add here? (el)	S3: Yes (rep)		12
<u>Repeat</u>	T: What did you, what did you have? (l)	S3: Computer programs, programming languages and other computer things such as modem and computer pads	T: OK (acc) So you, so we could add there computer programming. (i)	13

		studies. (rep)		
elicit	T: What was the second thing you said? (el)	S3: (5 sec pause) Programming languages. (rep)	T: And programming languages, OK. (acc) <i>writing on board</i> Thank you (acc) OK (z)	14
Elicit	T: Markus, did you have anything else to add to that? (n) Anything else that was different? (el)	S4: Er Words, Microsoft Words. (rep)	T: OK (z) <i>writing on board</i> (ack)	15
Student inform*	S4: Words (i)		T: Mm (ack)	16
<b>Boundary</b> Frame Focus	T: OK^ (m) So that's, that's a lot already there. So everybody's put something together there. (con)			17
Elicit	T: Vainö, did you add anything to that? (n) Is there anything you would like to add? (el)	S5: No (rep)	T: No, OK (acc)	18
<u>Re-initiate</u>	T: Marko? (n)	S6: NV (ack)	T: Nothing (acc)	19
<b>Boundary</b> Frame Focus	T: OK^ (m) So basically you are learning different kinds of computer programs and that's where you do it. (con) OK (m) That sounds, that sounds great. (e)			20
<b>Boundary</b> Frame Focus	T: Right^ (m) Now let's look at the big room, at the big room and put your ideas together with that. (ms)			21
Elicit*	T: Marko (n) Could you start (n) Number 3. What did you have for number 3? That big room where we were listening to Sami and Markus last week. (s) What did you have?	S6: (reading) We repair computers, TV's <i>ja teokkeet</i> (and amplifiers) (rep)	T: <i>Writing on board</i> (ack)	22
<u>Repeat*</u>	T: Did you say amplifiers? (l)	S6: Yes (rep)	T: Yes (acc)	23

elicit	T: Väinö, d'you have anything to add? (el)	S5: No (rep)	T: No (acc)	24
<u>Re-initiate</u>	T: Markos, Markus? (n)	S4: i)I er not er write to in computer S4: er maybe that big room? (rep)  ii)Mm, electrowork. (rep)	T: Yes, we're thinking of that big room now, that's right.(e)	25
<u>Repeat*</u>	T: Electronic work? (l)	S4: Mm (ack)	T: Yep (acc) <i>writing on board</i> (ack)	26
Elicit	T: Sami ?(n)	S3: Nothing to add (rep)	T: Nothing to add (acc)	27
Elicit	T: OK Janne (n) Do you have anything to add (s) Anything different you wrote? (el)	S2: NV Questioning look (rep)		28
<u>Re-initiate</u>	T: Number 3, number 3 (p)	S2: Study (rep)	T: You wrote study (acc) OK (acc)	29
Elicit*	T: Henkka did you have anything to add there? (n)	S1: <i>Onko video?</i> (is there video) (rep) T: No there isn't (rep)	T: <i>Writes on board</i> (ack)	30
<u>Listing</u>		S2: CD players (rep)	T: OK (acc), good (e)	31
Elicit	T: So, all of these, do you know a word that would include all of these? If we think of computers, TV's, amplifiers, videos, CD players. (s) Do you know a word? (el)	S4: Information word (rep)	T: That wasn't the word, the word I was thinking of. (e)	32

Inform*	T: If we think of them all as electronic equipment. (i) Do you know the word equipment? (s) Or electronic equipment, electronic machines? (el) So we can be general or we can be specific, and, and maybe it's more interesting to say what they actually are and it's simpler. (com)			33
Student inform*	S4: Tools, electronic tools. (i)		T: OK tools as well I'm sure (acc) Anything anybody wants you to repair I'm sure they send over. (com)	34
<b>Boundary Frame Focus</b>	T: OK^ (m) And then let's look at number 4 (ms)			35
Elicit	T: In the classroom that we didn't go in, we didn't even see it last week, what do you do there? It's quite a big room. What do you do there? (s) Sami, what did you have for that? (n)	<i>Long Pause</i>		36
<u>Re-initiate</u>	T: What did you have for number 4? (el)	S3: Theory of electronics (rep)	T: OK (acc)	37
Elicit*	T: So you study the theory of electronics? (el)	S3: Yeah (rep)	T: Right (acc) <i>writes on board.</i>	38
Elicit	T: Does anybody else have anything that you think you do in that room? (el)	S4: Er student and works. Er print paper (rep)		39
<u>Repeat</u>	T: OK (m) So you print? (l)	S4: Yeah (rep)	T: OK (acc)	40
Elicit	T: And you do your own private projects? (el)	S4: Yeah (rep)	T: Yes OK. (acc) <i>Writes on board</i> OK (z)	41
Elicit	T: Henkka, Janne (n) Did you have anything else? (el)	S1: No	T: No, OK. (acc)	42

<b>Boundary</b> Frame Focus	T: Right^ (m) (reading) 'Our course is 3 years long' (ms)			43
Student inform	S2: Hey teacher! (b) Theory lessons (rep)		T: Right, OK. Theory lessons (acc)	44
<b>Boundary</b> Focus	T: Number five, (reading) 'We do theory and practical work' (ms)			45

Classroom Analysis Extract II (1'46'')							
Ex. Type	Initiation (I)	Act	Response (R)	Act	Feedback (F)	Act	Ex
Student elicit*	S4: When er when er that course magazine is ready? (el)		T: When is it ready? (l)		S4: Yes		46
inform	T: Erm I think it is ready in one month or three weeks (i)				S4: Oh (ack)		47
Inform	T: So you will get it before the summer (i)				S4: Yeah (ack)		48
Inform	T: And if I remember right (i)						49
Student elicit	S5: Are we all get it?(el)						50
Student elicit*	S4: Can I (el)		T: Have your own copy (rep)				51
<u>repeat</u>	S4: What? (l)		T: You were asking if you can get your own copy (rep)		S4: Yeah (acc)		52
Inform*	T: I hope so yes(acc) There isn't enough for everybody, but not everybody wants. (com)						53
Student inform*	S4: Yeah, (m) But I er er really that want because I write very more etcetera. Er (laughs)(i) That magazine I write a here. (com)		T: Yes you've written for the magazine (ack) But nobody knows yet what is in the magazine because if they got more articles than they have space then they have to choose. (i)				54
Student inform	S4: Choose the special article what I like then. Er like that magazine er er erm using my huh huh huh (laughs) mm... (pause) editorials or maybe my book for...(i)				T: OK (ack)		55
Inform	T: But I'm not sure if what you have written is in there. (i) I don't know what they have chosen. I hope, I hope but I haven't looked (com)						56

## Appendix 2

### Transcription

#### Extract 1 (7'55'')

T: OK, I'd like to look through what everybody's got and put them together and then I'd like everybody to read out their own so I don't know if that takes longer than 15 minutes but we'll see. So 'welcome to our department my name is' and everybody's got their own name there's no problem with that. But number two: 'we have a small computer room where we..' so let's put ideas for that together. Henkka could you start. What do you do in the small computer room?

S1: We have a small computer room where we do work with autocad and *neljatoistas* (14 in Finnish) and pads.

T: |Do works...(*while writing on board*)

S1: | There's are different kinds of computer programs

T: OK, so we do work with autocad (*writes on board*)

S1: Autocad

T: and? (*while writing*)

S1: Pads. P A D S (spelling the word)

T: Fine. OK. Janne, did you have anything different from that?

S2: (reading) The room where are, *onko, onko sita kolme?* (Is it three?)

T: 's two, number two. Have you got anything different from...

S2: aside in Finnish to S1 concerning where he should be in the text.

S1: *sano nyt ensin tuo kakkonen* (say number two first)

S2 excell, excel.

T: OK. (*writing*) Anything else?

S2: No

T: No. OK Sami, did you have anything to add there?

S3: yes

T: What did you, what did you have?

S3: computer programs, programming languages other computer things such as modem and computer pads studies.

T: OK. So you, so we could add there computer programming. What was the second thing you said?

*5 sec pause*

S3: programming languages

T: and programming languages, OK. *(writing on board)* Thank you. OK . Markus, did you have anything else to add to that, anything else that was different?

S4: er words, microsoft words

T: OK *(writing on board)*

S4: Words

T: mm. OK so that's, that's a lot already there. So everybody's put something together there. Väinö, did you add anything to that? Is there anything you would like to add?

S5: No.

T: No. OK. Marko?

S6: grunt.

T: Nothing. OK. So basically you are learning different kinds of computer programs and that's where you do it. OK. That sounds, that sounds great. Right. Now let's look at the big room, the big room and put your ideas together with that. Marko, could you start. Number 3. What did you have for number 3? That big room where we were listening to Sami and Markus last week. What did you have?

S6: we repair computers, TV's *ja teokkeet* (and amplifiers)

T: Did you say amplifiers?

S6: Yes

T: Yes. Väinö, d'you have anything to add?

S5: No

T: No. Markos, Markus?

S4: I er not er write to in computer er maybe that big room?

T: Yes, we're thinking of the big room now, that's right.

S4: mm, electro work

T: electronic work?

S4: mm

T: yep.(*writing on board*) Sami?

S3: Nothing to add.

T: Nothing to add. OK Janne do you have anything to add? Anything different you wrote?

*Student looks questioning*

T: Number 3, number 3.

S2: study

T: You wrote study. OK. Henkka did you have anything to add there?

S1: *Onko video?* (Is there video?)

T: No, there isn't (*writes on board*)

S2: CD players

T: OK, good. So, all of these, do you know a word that you could say that would include all of these? If we think of computers, TV's amplifiers, videos, CD players. Do you know a word?

S3: Information word

T: mm. That wasn't the word I was, I was thinking of (*pause*)If we think of them all as electronic equipment. Do you know the word equipment? Or electronic equipment, electronic machines. So we can be general or we can be specific, and, and maybe it's more interesting to say what they actually are and it's simpler.

- S3: Tools. Electronic tools.
- T: OK tools as well I'm sure. Anything anybody wants you to repair I'm sure they send over. OK and then let's look at number 4. In the classroom that we didn't go in, we didn't even see it last week what do you do there? It's quite a big room. What do you do there? Sami what did you have for that? (*Long pause*) What did you have for number 4?
- S3: Theory of electronics.
- T: OK. So you study the theory of electronics?
- S3: Yeah.
- T: Right. (*writes on board*) Does anybody have anything else that you think you do in that room?
- S4: student and works. Print paper.
- T: OK so you print?
- S4: Yeah
- T: OK. And you do your own private, private projects?
- S4: Yeah
- T: Yes. OK. (*writes on board*) OK. Henkka, Janne did you have anything else?
- S1: No
- T: No. OK, Right. (*reading*) 'Our course is 3 years long ..'
- S2: Hey, teacher. Theory lessons
- T: Right, OK. Theory lessons. Number 5, Theory and practical work.

**Extract 2 (1'46'')**

- S4: When er when er that course magazine is ready?

T: When is it ready?

S4: Yes.

T: erm I think it is ready in one month or in 3 weeks.

S4: Oh

T: So you will get it before the summer

S4: Yeah

T: And if I remember right

S5: Are we all get it?

S4: Can I

T: have your own copy?

S4: What?

T: You were asking if you could get your own copy?

S4: Yes.

T: I hope so, yes. There aren't enough for everybody, but not everybody wants.

S4: Yeah, but I er er really that want because I write very more etcetera. Er (*Laughs.*) That magazine. I write a here.

T: Yes, you've written for the magazine, but nobody knows yet what is in the magazine because if they got more articles than they have space then they have to choose.

S4: Choose the special article what I like then. Like that magazine er er erm using my huh, huh huh (*laugh*) mm (*pause*) editorials or maybe my book for...

T: OK, but I'm not sure if what you have written is in there. I don't know what they have chosen. I hope, hope but I haven't looked.

